

## **APPENDIX A**

### **RURAL ZONES/DISTRICTS**

In 1975, Baltimore County adopted four new zoning classifications designed to protect the County's rural resources. The primary focus was to relieve development pressure on prime and productive farm land and the three metropolitan reservoirs and their tributaries. These new zones, known as resource conservation (R.C.) zones were first applied on the 1976 zoning maps. Three of the four classifications are found within the Hanover Pike Study area and are described in the following paragraphs.

#### **R.C.2 (Agricultural)**

This classification was established to foster conditions favorable for continued agricultural use of the productive agricultural areas of Baltimore County. By design, this zone discourages incompatible forms of development which inevitably lead to the loss of productive farm land. Some uses are permitted by special exception which requires a public hearing before the zoning commissioner.

Residential development is limited to two lots per parcel on tracts between two and 100 acres. Parcels over 100 acres receive one additional lot for each 50 acres. Only one principal dwelling is permitted on any lot, and no lot may be less than one acre.

The development regulations prohibit any development on a property's prime and/or productive soils. Further, allowed development must not interfere with existing or future agricultural use of the property.

This zone also encourages land owners to place their land in the Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Program in order to permanently preserve productive farm land. Also, options which may be more appropriate to individual property owners are available such as the Maryland Environmental Trust, the Trust For Public Lands, and the American Farm Land Trust among others.

#### **R.C.4 (Watershed Protection)**

The R.C.4 zone and its regulations protect the water supplies of metropolitan Baltimore and neighboring jurisdictions by preventing contamination through unsuitable types or levels of development in the watersheds. A significant portion of the Hanover Pike study area lies within the Liberty Reservoir drainage area.

This zone is a low-density, single-family rural classification which allows residential development on large lots with a series of environmental conditions designed to minimize the impact of development on streams and the reservoir. It has a density of 0.2 units an acre and a minimum lot size of three acres. Typically, lot sizes exceed the three-acre minimum because the density equals one lot for each five acres and the topography of these areas includes steep slopes. The environmental constraints require that not more than 10 percent of any lot may be covered with impermeable surfaces and that not more than 25 percent of the natural vegetation may be removed from the lot. In order to prevent long narrow lots, a diameter of not less than 300 feet is required.

Other development and environmental requirements further control the development and placement of structures in this zoning

Other development and environmental requirements further control the development and placement of structures in this zoning classification. For example, there are stream, wetland, steep slope, and woodland buffers, roadway design standards, and building to property line setbacks which must be addressed.

Land use is also limited because of the nature of the zone. Generally, land uses which require significant grading and parking have been discouraged. Where some of these uses have been permitted, they require a special exception from the zoning commissioner.

#### **R.C.5 (Rural Residential**

This zone was designed to provide for rural residential development in suitable areas where basic public water and sewer service is not available but lots have sufficient size for adequate on-lot systems. This zone is intended to direct rural development into areas that have already been sufficiently developed near rural centers which prevents the continuation of agriculture.

The R.C.5 zone has a permitted maximum density of .667 units an acre and a minimum lot size of one acre. This single-family zone has consistently developed at .400 units an acre. There is a maximum 15 percent coverage for each lot and not more than one dwelling is permitted on each lot.

Besides the permitted residential dwellings, this zone permits churches, schools, and farms with accessory uses and structures. The County's development regulations may control the placement of buildings depending on their relationship to streams, wetlands, steep slopes, and woodlands.

#### **R.C.C. (Resource Conservation Commercial) Zone**

The R.C.C. zone was established in 1988 by the Baltimore County Council (Bill No. 103-88) to provide small areas of commercial development for a limited range of rural, residential, and tourist-related needs; and to permit such facilities only at an intensity and scale appropriate to rural areas. This plan recommends that certain properties are appropriate for this zoning classification and that they are unsuitable for the standard commercial zones. By design, this classification is meant to be a "stand alone" zone which will accommodate its entire use.

#### **The Commercial Rural (C.R.) District**

Adopted by the County Council on July 5, 1988, the C.R. district provides regulations for development that can be sustained by the environment, improve the aesthetics of rural commercial development, and protect historic features.

In particular, the C.R. district is intended "for use in those rural locations, usually villages or small towns, which already function as commercial service centers. These areas...are now in danger of losing their local identities due to rapid development, permitted by existing zoning patterns. The district provides development opportunities for convenience shopping and personal services that are customarily and frequently needed by the rural residential and agricultural population and tourists."

The C.R. District may be applied to land zoned B.L., B.M., B.R., R.O. and to adjacent R.C.5-zoned land. Its conditions, applied against uses permitted in the base zone, are as follows:

- ☐ Uses normally permitted in the base zone will have limitations of size regulations and site design controls.
- ☐ Uses permitted in the C.R. district but not in the base zone may only be permitted by special exception.
- ☐ Development that proposes to exceed the size and site design regulations if the C.R. district may only be permitted by special exception.
- ☐ Criteria for granting special exceptions will be strengthened by including additional performance standards such as size and site standards, architectural guidelines, protection of historic buildings, and certification that the larger project can be supported by the site's environmental capabilities.

Such elements of size and site design are, for example, the 8,800-square-foot (gross) limit on buildings, 15-foot setbacks, and specific requirements on landscaping and signs. Environmental elements evaluated would include the stability of the private sewerage disposal system, the potable water supply, and the influence on the metropolitan reservoirs.

The 8,800 sq. ft. limit may be exceeded when properties in a C.R. District are part of an adopted community plan. However, any increase will be subject to review at a Special Exception Hearing to ensure compatibility with the stated goals and objectives of the plan.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **ASSESSMENT OF THE HANOVER PIKE ALTERNATIVES**

#### **Assessment Methodology**

Because Hanover Pike is a state highway, MDOT is responsible for choosing the location and design of any improvements. With current fiscal constraints, the department is unlikely to make this decision within five years, and the decision will be made only after very detailed project planning and environmental studies. However, a local jurisdiction's support for a facility and its location is important in the State's decision-making process.

The County's assessment process is not as rigorous as the State's but is designed to eliminate alignments that apparently contain fatal qualitative flaws.

Ten criteria were used to rank the alignment options. These criteria indicate that Hanover Pike relocated is not only for improving traffic flow and safety but is an important part of the County's infrastructure and must also support objectives for land use, environmental protection, and development.

#### **List of Assessment Criteria**

- Preserving farm land
- Preserving existing towns
- Environmental soundness
- Citizen support
- Reducing the impact truck traffic on existing communities
- Reducing traffic conflicts with existing communities
- Supporting the regional transportation planning process

Supporting development recommendations

Minimizing property acquisition

Improving air quality

A three-point scale was used to assess each option's ability to meet the criteria.

#### **Ranking Scale**

+1 beneficial impact or positive support

0 neutral impact or unknown support

-1 detrimental impacts or no support

Because two of the criteria -- public support and environmental soundness -- are so significant, an alignment receiving negative scores in both categories was considered fatally flawed and removed from further consideration. An alignment that received a negative score in one of these categories was deemed to have significant problems but not removed from consideration.

#### **Assessment Results**

Both Option 1 and Option 5 were judged to be fatally flawed because of their potential negative environmental impact and their lack of citizen support, and the remaining options received negative scores in one of the two critical categories. Option 3 suffers from lack of citizen support, while options 2 and 4 are likely to produce significant environmental damage.

Option 2 had the highest score, and option 3 was second highest while Option 1 scored lowest.

Environmental regulatory agencies are unlikely to approve any road construction west

of the present alignment because of the potential for significant environmental damage to streams flowing into Liberty Reservoir.

The existing highway crosses many of these streams, and representatives of the various environmental agencies have warned that widening the existing alignment will be evaluated as new construction. Current environmental regulations would probably forbid construction along the existing Hanover Pike or make it prohibitively costly to construct.

### APPENDIX C

CRITERIA	OPTIONS					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Preserving farm land.....	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-1
Preserving existing towns .....	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
Environmental soundness .....	-1	-1	+1	-1	0	-1
Citizen support .....	-1	0	-1	+1	+1	-1
Reducing the impact of trucks on communities.....	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1
Reducing traffic conflicts with existing communities.....	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1
Supporting the regional transportation planning process.....	0	0	0	-1	0	0
Supporting development recommendations.....	0	0	0	-1	0	0
Minimizing residential property acquisition.....	-1	0	0	0	0	0
Improving air quality .....	-1	+1	+1	0	-1	+1
Score .....	-5	+4	+2	0	+1	0

## **APPENDIX C**

### **ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION**

Two environmental reports were prepared for the properties which were the subject of a request for a zoning change to M.L.R. and were submitted to the Baltimore County Department Environmental Protection and Resource Management. These are:

(i) "Stormwater Pollutant Load Analysis," prepared by Daft, McCune & Walker and dated April 24, 1990.

(ii) "Resource Inventory and Development Suitability Analysis," prepared by Biohabitat Inc. dated April 9, 1990.

Because of their size, these reports are not included in this document. Copies can be seen in the Baltimore County Office of Planning and Zoning, 4th floor (Room 406) New Courts Building, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland, and at the Towson Public Library. Both reports were considered acceptable to the Baltimore County Department of Environmental Protection and Resource Management.

HANOVER PIKE CORRIDOR STUDY ADVISORY GROUP

Mr. H. Jack Barnhart  
Col. Steven Blum  
Mr. Charles R. Broderick  
Mr. Noel Cervino  
Mr. Thomas Christler  
Mr. Richard Curran  
Mr. Philip Earls  
Mr. James Eline  
Mr. Ned Finney  
Mr. Richard R. Forbes  
Ms. Peggy Goodman  
Ms. Anne Grace Hendrickson  
Mr. Victor Hencken  
Mr. Robert Hoffman

Mr. Stuart Kaplow  
Mr. Al Lewis  
Mr. Wilson Lippy  
Mr. John W. Livermore  
Ms. Brenda Mandel  
Mr. Timothy Mullan  
Mr. George Nubeck  
Mr. Ed St. John  
Mr. Raymond Weber  
Ms. Margaret Worrall  
Mr. Darryl Wyles  
Mr. Rob Yingling



Baltimore County  
Office of Planning & Zoning  
County Courts Building  
401 Bosley Avenue  
Towson, Maryland 21204